UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

JAN 2 5 2010

OFFICE OF
ECOSYSTEMS, TRIBAL AND
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Ms. Amy Burt, Environmental Planner
Naval Facilities Engineering Command Northwest
1101 Tautog Circle, Suite 203
Silverdale, Washington 98315-1101

RE: EPA Comments on the DOD Draft EIS/OEIS for the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities, EPA # 089-028-DOD

Dear Ms. Burt:

EPA has reviewed the above-referenced document (CEQ No. 20090424) in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Section 309 specifically directs EPA to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts associated with all major federal actions. Under our policies and procedures, we assign a rating to the Draft EIS/OEIS (herein EIS) based on the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the document's adequacy in meeting NEPA requirements.

The EIS evaluates the potential impacts associated with current and proposed Navy training activities within the Temporary Maritime Activities Area (TMAA) located in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA). The TMAA covers an area of 42,146 square nautical miles (nm^2) of surface and subsurface ocean training area and overlying airspace. The No Action Alternative evaluates the current level of Navy training in the TMAA, which entails an annual exercise of one joint force exercise occurring over a period of no more than 14 days during the summer months. Alternative 1 includes the activities under the No Action Alternative, as well as anti-submarine warfare training, use of active sonar, and incorporation of additional training activities to incorporate force structure changes. The period for training would also increase up to 21 days. Alternative 2, the Navy's Preferred Alternative, would essentially double the activity under Alternative 1 as well as incorporate a SINKEX exercise, up to 2 times per year.

Overall we find the document to be well-organized, and the tables and maps that are included are very helpful to the reader. We recognize the short-term nature of these activities, and applaud the Navy for developing an EIS in an attempt to fully evaluate the impacts of these activities. We also appreciate that the Navy considered to the extent possible other influences and stressors on resources in the TMAA, such as climate change, and went to great lengths to include a quantitative comparison of alternatives that clearly identifies the differences in impacts amongst those alternatives.

We do have concerns, however, regarding the limited range of alternatives considered, the analysis and disclosure of impacts, lack of analysis of wastewater discharges, impacts from munitions, impacts to marine mammals from mid-range active sonar, and the limited discussion

regarding mitigation activities (such as turtle-free zones). We also offer some suggestions we believe would improve the analysis, such as incorporating more detailed information on EPA's general permit and the related Letter Agreement for SINKEX, and current information for the PM 2.5 designation for the Fairbanks area, for your inclusion in the Final EIS (Enclosure 1).

We have assigned a rating of "EC-2" (Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information) to the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft EIS. A copy of EPA's rating system criteria used in conducting our environmental review is enclosed (Enclosure 2). Our rating and a copy of our comments will be published in the *Federal Register*.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide written comments on the Gulf of Alaska Navy Training Activities Draft EIS/OEIS. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Jennifer Curtis of my staff at (907) 271-6324 or curtis.jennifer@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Christine B. Reichgott

Christine B. Reichgott, Manager
Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit

Enclosures

EPA REGION 10 DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE GULF OF ALASKA NAVY TRAINING EXERCISES DRAFT EIS/OEIS

Limited Range of Alternatives

The EIS evaluates a limited range of alternatives. We believe the alternatives analysis would be much improved by including alternatives that represent a more diverse level and mix of training instead of evaluating alternatives that simply build upon one another. The inclusion of an alternative with additional appropriate mitigation (40 CFR 1502.14(f)) would also expand the range of alternatives. The use of geographic and/or temporal exclusions, even within the current timeframe and TMAA, can potentially be effective in reducing impacts to marine resources. We note that the DEIS considers this suggestion in the section discussing alternatives considered but dismissed (Section 2.3.2), but does not consider restrictions within the TMAA or identified timeframe. EPA supports the selection of alternatives that minimize the impacts to the environment while meeting the project's purpose and need. For this project, we identify Alternative 1 as the action alternative with the least impacts.

Recommendation

EPA recommends that an alternative with additional mitigation measures be developed in the Final EIS, possibly incorporating geographic and/or temporal exclusions. We recommend the identification of geographic areas where training restrictions would be especially beneficial to environmental resources, such as the Seamounts and other areas with substantial upwelling, and additional discussion of how excluding such an area would affect training goals and the underlying purpose and need. We also recommend that the Navy reconsider its selection of Alternative 2 as its Preferred Alternative as it is the alternative with the greatest impacts to resources and the environment.

Analysis and Disclosure of Impacts

We are concerned that the some of the potential impacts from project activities are not properly disclosed in the EIS. Conclusions of "no substantial effect" are not always adequately demonstrated and, on some occasions, the lack of knowledge regarding resource impacts seems to be presented as justification for a conclusion of no substantial impact. This approach is frequently in the impacts analysis, and may result in some impacts being underestimated. A possible reason for these deficiencies could be the lack of data or understanding of resources and systems in the GOA. In addition, the EIS tends to assume an even distribution of resources and impacts, which does not accurately reflect the natural distribution of aquatic resources, or the likely nature of distribution and disbursement of impacts. As a result of the approach taken, the EIS seems to have averaged the impacts over the TMAA and concluded that localized impacts would be minimal and temporary, and thus not substantial. This may not be accurate, even in the open ocean.

The following are specific examples of the above concerns:

Water quality impacts. The EIS acknowledges unavoidable effects on ocean and surface water quality, including the introduction of hazardous materials from munitions, yet

concludes that no long-term impacts to water resources would occur, and short-term impacts are not addressed.

Sonar impacts on fish. The EIS acknowledges that the "effects of sound on fish are largely unknown" and that there is a "dearth of empirical information on the effects of exposure to sound, let alone sonar, for the vast majority of fish." However, the EIS documents a study that showed a statistically significant post-exposure mortality of 20 to 30% from simulated Naval sonar signals, and another that found the use of continuous-wave transmissions within the frequency band corresponding to swim bladder resonance will escalate this impact by an order of magnitude, resulting in affects to 0.6 percent of the total stock of juvenile fish. There is no discussion, however, that continuous-wave transmissions at such frequency will not be employed, nor is there discussion regarding the avoidance measures in response to identification of populations of fish at more vulnerable life stages. The EIS concludes, however, that "limited information currently available suggests that populations of fish are unlikely to be affected by the projected rates and areas of use of military sonar."

Recommendation

We recommend the conclusions drawn in the impact analysis be reevaluated and where impacts are unknown or potentially more substantial, the EIS be revised to reflect this. We also recommend that the assumption of even distribution/disbursement or resources and impacts be reconsidered and revised, if possible, to more accurately reflect the actual spatial and temporal distribution of both.

Wastewater Discharges

The EIS states that discharges from military vessels are not considered point source discharges under the Clean Water Act but that there are Uniform National Discharge Standards for 25 discharges for military vessels up to 12 nm. Since the EIS only considers activities beyond 12 nm, it is unclear why this information was included, particularly since there is no discussion of what the anticipated wastewater discharges (type and volume) will actually occur. There is also no discussion of the impacts that will result from the wastewater discharges.

Recommendation

EPA recommends that the Final EIS clearly identify any applicable restrictions to wastewater discharges (if any) for the proposed action, the projected types and volumes of discharges, and the anticipated impacts to marine resources from those discharges. We also recommend that the Navy consider additional appropriate mitigation measures to minimize the discharges and subsequent impacts of those discharges.

Impacts from Munitions

The EIS identifies the potential for contamination from munitions components including various heavy metals releases from sonobuoys, leaching of hazardous bomb materials, release of cyanide from torpedoes, various explosives compounds such as ammonium perchlorate, picric acid, etc., and organic chemicals from underwater detonations. The EIS concludes that there would be no long-term or substantial degradation of water resources and no short-term impacts because contaminants would be diluted in the ocean and metal materials would corrode, thus preventing the deterioration of certain objects.

We understand the assumption regarding ocean dilution; however, we believe the assumption should be substantiated with monitoring data, particularly since such activates have been occurring for nearly a decade, and are expected to continue (and possibly increase in frequency and duration) into the foreseeable future. Because of the cumulative impacts to ocean water quality, good stewardship can no longer assume that the size of the ocean will dilute and disperse all pollutants to safe levels, especially considering that metals such as copper and lead bioaccumulate in marine organisms.

Recommendation

We recommend the development and implementation of a monitoring program for the GOA to validate the Navy's conclusions that impacts would not result in long-term degradation of water resources. The Navy should conduct the necessary monitoring to substantiate the assumptions being made regarding the lack of impacts from munitions releases into the ocean environment.

Impacts to Marine Mammals from Mid-frequency Active (MFA) Sonar

We have concerns regarding impacts to marine mammals from MFA sonar in an area that historically has not had MFA sonar activity, or such activity is not disclosed in the EIS. The EIS estimates that the Preferred Alternative will result in a total of 425,551 Level B harassments from active sonar and other non-sonar acoustic sources, and possibly one Level A harassment, affecting all species of marine mammals, including all seven listed species.

We are also concerned that the impact assessment methodology (derivation of marine mammal density) assumes a uniform distribution of animals although the EIS clearly states that this is "rarely likely true". The EIS recognizes that there are many unknowns in assessing the effects and significance of marine mammal responses to sound exposures but makes no judgment based on the estimated number of harassments as to whether these impacts are anticipated to significantly affect the species. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations list criteria for assessing significance: the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial, the degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks, and the degree to which the action may adversely affect endangered or threatened species (40 CFR 1508.27(4),(5) and (9) respectively). When considered in this light, impacts of MFA sonar on marine mammals may be considered significant under NEPA. We understand the Navy is working with the National Marine Fisheries Service to obtain a Letter of Authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

Recommendation

We recommend the Navy consider the scientific controversy, uncertain/unknown risks, and presence of threatened and endangered species in assessing significance of impacts from MFA sonar on marine resources. EPA recommends the Navy operate sonar at the lowest practicable level to achieve mandated training levels. We recommend the approach taken for the Hawaii Range Complex be utilized, where an additional alternative was created for the Final EIS that held sonar use at minimal (existing) levels while increasing training activity.

Mitigation Discussion and Effectiveness

Although the EIS dedicates a full chapter to mitigation, and incorporates mitigation discussion in the impact analysis, there are several instances where the mitigation measure is not clearly identified or defined, and the relevance of the measure to actual impacts is not explained. There are also references to best management practices, Navy policies and standard operating procedures, but specific actions are not always identified, and when they are, no discussion of the anticipated effectiveness of mitigation occurs. It is important that mitigation measures be discussed, especially if they are the basis for concluding that impacts will not be substantial or will not occur at all. Results of monitoring of training impacts would also be helpful to include in mitigation discussions.

Recommendation

EPA recommends further refinement of mitigation measures to include clear identification of the measure (i.e. turtle-free zone), a discussion of the anticipated effectiveness and likelihood of implementation. Monitoring efforts should be included.

General Comments

Discussion regarding SINKEX

The EIS states that the sinking exercise (SINKEX) activities will be "conducted under the auspices of a permit from the USEPA". We recognize that this is a reference to the general permit issued by EPA under the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) for the SINKEX. However the EIS presents very little information about the requirements and conditions of this permit, or the related August 1999 Letter Agreement between the Navy and EPA.

In addition, the EIS refers to the potential for floating non-hazardous expended material to be lost (to become persistent seabed litter) or washed ashore as flotsam. It should be noted that the SINKEX general permit states that "Before sinking, appropriate measures shall be taken by qualified personnel at a Navy or other certified facility to remove **to the maximum extent practicable** all materials which may degrade the marine environment, including without limitation removing from the hulls other pollutants and all readily detachable material capable of creating debris or contributing to chemical pollution." If the sinking exercise could create floating non-hazardous expended material that will create persistent marine debris or has the potential to wash ashore, the Navy must attempt to remove such material from the marine environment. While disposal of materials during SINKEX is a permitted activity, the EIS should disclose the amount of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that would be disposed into the ocean under each of the project alternatives.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Final EIS include additional discussion to inform the reader of the conditions with the permit and agreement, including but not limited to: the removal of all PCB transformers and large capacitors; the removal of all small capacitors to the greatest extent practical; removal of readily detachable solid PCB items; the cleaning of petroleum from

tanks; piping and reservoirs, as well as the removal of trash, floatable materials, and mercury or fluorocarbon containing materials. The Final EIS should clearly note that the requirements of both the 1999 EPA/Navy agreement and the SINKEX General Permit under 40 CFR 229.2 are to be met in order to comply with the MPRSA SINKEX General Permit. For material that is expected to become flotsam or beach debris, we recommend the consideration of additional mitigation, such as supporting marine debris cleanup efforts in areas potentially affected by such debris.

PM2.5 Designation for Fairbanks

EPA recently finalized its rule to designate portions of the Fairbanks North Star Borough as non-attainment for PM2.5. The EIS currently contains information that is now out-of-date.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Final EIS be updated to reflect the current designation as discussed in the final rule. Please see Final Rule at: (http://frwebgate6.access.gpo.gov/cgibin/PDFgate.cgi?WAISdocID=104316123081+4+2+0&WAISaction=retrieve).

Evaluation of World War II Dumps in the GOA

During scoping, commenters identified concerns regarding past dumpsites from the World War II era, and requested that the Navy reidentify those and consider them in the analysis. There does not appear to be any discussion regarding these sites in the document outside of the scoping summary.

Recommendation

While specific information relating to the existence, location and possible constituents of past marine dump sites may not be readily available, we recommend that any reliable information (e.g. information from the marine charts referenced by the commenter) currently available be reviewed and any conclusions, even general, regarding these sites be included in the cumulative impacts assessment in the Final EIS, if possible.

Programmatic Nature of EIS

Although the document is not currently identified as a Programmatic EIS, it does appear that the EIS is programmatic in nature as it identifies, for an unknown period of time, activities that could occur within a specified range in magnitude, scale, and timeframe. As such, it may beneficial for the Navy to identify the document as programmatic and also set an estimated timeframe for which these activities re anticipated to occur (i.e. 5 or 10 years) before reevaluation, regardless of changes to the activities. We believe that reevaluation at regular intervals is important given the complexity of the marine dynamics as well as the substantial changes being observed in the GOA.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Navy consider identifying the document as a Programmatic EIS and determine a timeframe for reevaluation.

Consideration of MPRSA

The MPRSA is not currently listed in several lists or discussions of environmental laws applicable to this project, even though it is quite relevant to the SINKEX activities.

Recommendation

We recommend including the MPRSA in lists and discussions of environmental laws throughout the document where appropriate.

ENCLOSURE 2

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Rating System for Draft Environmental Impact Statements Definitions and Follow-Up Action*

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO – Lack of Objections

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC – Environmental Concerns

EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce these impacts.

EO – Environmental Objections

EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no-action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU – Environmentally Unsatisfactory

EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1 – Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis of data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2 – Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3 – Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act and or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

* From EPA Manual 1640 Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment. February, 1987.